

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR			ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09/050,113	03/30/98	EMA		Т	980446
023850 MM91/0628 ARMSTRONG,WESTERMAN, HATTORI,			\neg	EXAMINER WARREN, M	
MCLELAND & NAUGHTON, LLP				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	EET, NW, SU	SUITE 1000		2815	
				DATE MAILED:	06/28/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trad marks

1- File Copy

Advisory Action	09/050,113	EMA, TAIJI					
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Matthew E. Warren	2815					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address							
THE REPLY FILED 13 June 2001 FAILS TO PLACE THE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appe Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	1) a timely filed amendment which all (with appeal fee); or (3) a time	th places the application in					
PERIOD FOR REPLY [check only a) or b)]							
 a)	wo months as set forth in MPEP § 706.07 (continues to run from the mailing date of the lod for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS	from the					
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The data been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension of the second of extension of the second of extension of the shortener (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three meanned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	d statutory period for reply originally set in to onths after the mailing date of the final reje	he final Office action; or (2) as set forth i ction, even if timely filed, may reduce any					
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37CF	R 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal o	і ше арреаі.					
2. The proposed amendment(s) will be entered upon with requisite fees.	n the timely submission of a Noti	ce of Appeal and Appeal Brief					
3. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered I							
(a) they raise new issues that would require furth	her consideration and/or search.	(see NOTE below);					
(b) They raise the issue of new matter. (see Note	e below);						
(c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or			he				
(d) they present additional claims without cance	eling a corresponding number of	finally rejected claims.					
4. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	ction(s):						
5. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) woul canceling the non-allowable claim(s).		separate, timely filed amendme	nt				
6. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request fapplication in condition for allowance because:	See Continuation Sneet.)				
7. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered by raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	pecause it is not directed SOLEL						
8. For purposes of Appeal, the status of the claim(s	s) is as follows (see attached writt	en explanation, if any):					
Claim(s) allowed:							
Claim(s) objected to: <u>1 and 36</u> .							
Claim(s) rejected: 2-14, and 37.							
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:							
9. The proposed drawing correction filed on	a)□has b)□ has not been ap	proved by the Examiner.					
10. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stater	ment(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	· _ ·					
11. Other:		/					
_	//_						

Application No.

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTO-303 (Rev. 01-01)

Advisory Action

SUPERVISORY PATENT, EXAMINER 2 TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800

Applicant(s)

Continuation of 6. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: the arguments in response to the 112 First Paragraph Rejection are not persuasive. The language pertaining to the contact hole having a second width subtracted twice a width of the sidewall insulation is not supported by the spec. The parameter of the width subtracted twice a width of the sidewall insulation cannot be determined from the drawings either because the drawings are not drawn to scale. Furthermore, the limitation is somewhat vague in that the second width is not clearly defined-the second width could be the space between the sidewall insulators, the space including the sidewall insulators, or both. Also the limitation concerning the contact hole end defined by the conductor patterns is so broad that the cited art of Hiroshi discloses the limitation.